

In his memo, Hartman noted that, after the Minneapolis Area Office submitted its findings, the Town of Troy passed a resolution in December 1994 opposing the proposal. The City of Hudson submitted a resolution opposing the casino application – notwithstanding the earlier letter from Mayor Thomas Redner supporting the project. St. Croix County wrote that it would take no position on the Hudson Common Council resolution and offered little more. Hartman remarked that the City of Hudson’s resolution – like other objections submitted by St. Croix County and the Town of Troy – lacked evidence to support its assertions of potential harm. Accordingly, Hartman concluded that these objections could be given no significant weight.³⁷⁷

Hartman also analyzed the further objections submitted by nearby tribes, most of which focused on the potential impact of a Hudson casino on their existing gaming facilities. He acknowledged that the Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin said their operation was not likely to be hurt due to its distance from Hudson. At the same time, he noted they complained without hard evidence of “growing undue pressure from outside non-Indian gambling interests that could set the stage for inter-Tribal rivalry for gaming dollars.”

³⁷⁶(...continued)

The record indicates that the St. Croix Casino in Turtle Lake, which is located within a 50-mile radius of the proposed trust acquisition, would be impacted. And, while competition alone would generally not be enough to conclude that any acquisition would be detrimental, it is a significant factor in this particular case. . . . Rather than seek acquisition of land closer to their own reservations, the Tribes chose to ‘migrate’ to a location in close proximity to another tribe’s market area and casino.

³⁷⁷The memo contains no discussion of the positions taken by Wisconsin state legislators or U.S. Congressmen and Senators. Another draft of Hartman’s memo revised after June 8 – which was addressed to the Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs through the Deputy Commissioner of Indian Affairs – discussed the views of state officials, but neither draft of the memo mentions the views of any federal elected officials.